



Community Preservation Committee

Regular

~ Minutes ~

36 Court Street
Springfield, MA 01103
<http://www.springfieldcityhall.com>

Kevin Chaffee

Tuesday, September 3, 2019

6:00 PM

See Agenda

I. Call to Order

6:00 PM Meeting called to order on September 3, 2019 at See Agenda, City of Springfield, Springfield, MA.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
---------------	-------	--------	---------

II. Public Portion

III. Minutes

**Springfield Preservation Committee
September 3, 2019 at 6:00 pm
City Hall Room 23
36 Court Street, Springfield**

Present: Lamar Cook, David Finn, Juanita Martinez, Robert McCarroll, Terry Mitchell
Angela Robles, Ralph Slate

Absent: Gloria DeFillipo, Terry Rodriguez

Mr. McCarroll began the meeting at 6:00 pm. He introduced the Administrative Consultant Ms. Karen Lee. He reported that her contract is in the signature process going around to the various offices. We hope that in a couple of weeks she will be on board with us, so welcome! He stated that we have a public speak out so if she would like to say something she can. Ms. Lee said that she was happy to be here and pleased to meet all those present and "thank you for hiring me."

Mr. Slate moved to approve minutes of August 6; Mr. Finn seconded. A unanimous vote was taken.

Mr. McCarroll stated that Ms. Lee would soon be on board in a couple of weeks. He reported that Ms. DeFillipo has a call into Whalley Computer so the city has a price agreement with two computer companies and she agreed to contact them to see what they have available because we have voted to purchase a lap top and a small printer that our administrative consultant will get to use for CPA work.

FY18 Funding Approval Update: Mr. McCarroll stated that since FY18 was the first year that we actually had money approved by the City Council, September 15 is the first time that we have to report to the Department of Revenue what the projects are, how much they are, whether they are in process, underway, completed or cancelled. He has filed the report. In the future, the Administrative Consultant will take care of that. The only contract that hasn't been signed is the

Conservation Trail Head Signage. We seem to be at somewhat of an impasse. Just to bring everyone up to speed last year they came in with a proposal for signage at five conservation areas that had walking trails. He continued that their sign was very nice, it was green with the letters in gold that you see in the neighborhoods that would say the Conservation Commission Name and the Conservation Commission and at some point acknowledge CPA. There was a discussion here that we thought it needed to say more than just that. It shouldn't just be naming the Conservation Area. We should be featuring the recreational opportunity that was found in the conservation area which is the walking trail. There was a sub-committee that was Ms. Defillipo, Ms. Martinez and Mr. McCarroll talked about wording. When we recommended it to the City Council it went with the condition that the design and the text be approved by the CPC, not what they had submitted had already been approved by the CPC. So when we wanted the words that said White Cedar Bog Conservation Area Walking Trail there seemed to be some reluctance to do that. Ms. Martinez stated that she could see two signs and I think it would be great. One is to announce what the area is but not to pick one thing. That would be like a State Park announcing the park and saying swimming, when there is so much more than swimming. Originally, it was because people have said that they don't know the area. So the sign announces what it is and that is what the intent was. However, another sign can state that this is the trail head.

Mr. Slate stated that when he voted on this what was going through his mind was we have these Conservation Areas that have trails in them and this will allow people to use them because it was called Trail Head and Signage which was the name of their proposal. He voted on there being a sign there that would state White Cedar Bog and there is a trail there. He wouldn't have voted for it if it just said this is White Cedar Bog Conservation Area. He thought what really sold this was the trail head markings. Mr. McCarroll added that Kevin Chaffee was at the initial meeting and there was talk that he wanted the signs to be more user friendly. Ms. Martinez responded by stating that the idea was that the people in the city don't even know. The idea was to let people know that's what this area is. Ms. Robles asked if you were to put a sign up that said White Cedar Bog Conservation Area as a random person who really didn't know much about conservation areas might think that I should stay away from it. Mr. Finn asked could you only have one sign that would bring notice that it's a Conservation Area but here is a list of things that you can do here, one of them being able to walk on the trail. It would eliminate two signs. Mr. McCarroll suggested that besides this large sign at the trail heads there are going to be two metal bollards to mark the trail entrance, is it possible that "Walking Trail" would be painted on it. That could be a compromise. Ms. Martinez moved that we want the words Walking Trail on the trail head bollards; Ms. Robles seconded. A unanimous vote was taken.

FY19 Year-End Budget Update: Mr. McCarroll stated that at the last meeting we had two questions that he said he would ask Stuart. At the beginning of every fiscal year, we have to have a City Council approved budget and we have to put aside ten percent of our expected revenue for Historic, Open Space and Recreation, and for Housing. Do we have to re-adjust it at the end of the year if we bring in more money than anticipated. Stuart said that the Department of Revenue has ruled that if it is a minor amount at the end of the year, we don't have to worry

about adjusting the budget. If it were a significant difference we would have to go through it again.

Mr. McCarroll said reported about the new State revenues that are coming into CPA. The increased fee goes into effect on December 31. FY20 will not be affected by the increased revenue. In November, 2020 we will get ten-months worth of increased revenue. In November, 2021 we will see the results of the full twelve months of the higher fees. When they are all clicked in, we will be getting based on how much we locally raise now about \$450,000. What there is in the State Legislation that was passed is that if there is adjusted net surplus. So the fiscal year ended for the State on June 30. If there is a surplus the legislature gets to spend that money by amending the old Budget. They get to do that for two months. If by mid - September they haven't decided to go into the surplus and spend it on other projects it is called the Net Adjusted Surplus. If there is money there we may get it. The amount that was in the legislation was twenty million to come to CPA and there was a clause in line before us which is the Massachusetts Bio-Life Trust and they are in for \$10 million. So indeed there is no surplus because the Legislators divided up the whole surplus. If there is lets say fifteen million, Mass Bio Life gets the first ten million CPA gets the remaining five million. For CPA to get the full amount there has to be an adjusted net surplus of \$30 million. We won't know for another month or so.

Mr. McCarroll stated that tonight we have to make final decisions on what we want to do with three projects that we tabled from last time. He asked those present if they received the spread sheet that he sent out. What I'm trying to do is see where we allocated the money. What we did was we funded three projects and we took them all or partially from the Historic Reserve of \$144,300 so we emptied out that reserve. We funded the Westminster Street Children's Playground using in part the other \$144,300 that is in the Recreation Open Space Reserve so we emptied that out. We have not made a decision yet as to our Housing reserve, we have only one Housing project. What we have in that is money that is kept in the Fiscal 18 reserve. We have \$31,100 reserved solely for the Housing projects are the \$144,000 and the \$31,100. We have allocated to date out of the Undesignated Reserve one million six all the other projects have come out of that Undesignated Reserve. He stated that by his calculation we have about \$176,000 that we can allocate. If we decide that we are going to re-allocate the \$100,000 that the City Council didn't allocate to the trustees of the Historic Preservation Fund last year we have \$276,000. When we are done making our decisions he will notify the Budget office to draft the financial order to go to City Council for September 16.

Mr. McCarroll stated that there three projects left. The highest rank down of the remaining three is the Mason Square Apartments where they are asking for \$250,000 as part of a thirty-one million that would be renovating the now vacant fire station and the now vacant State Street wing of the Indian Motorcycle Building to income eligible housing. His funding sources require that he go even lower than CPA would require. He also said that he sent their breakdown of the money. Mr. Slate stated that it's a Thirty-One Million Dollar project and they are asking for \$250,000 which is like a rounding error on a Thirty-One Million Dollar project. Why give

\$250,000 of money that we have in very short supply to this larger project which is already being funded at a very high level. It's not really in line with some of the goals that we set for housing which we were trying to target. It's that section of income which is not usually targeted which is between 80 to 100 percent of median income or maybe 60 to and 100 percent of median income. This project is not able to do that because they are using all the other low income tax credits. This housing is reserved for 60 percent of median and below. The counter argument was that we have \$175,400 that we can't spend otherwise because we don't have any other housing projects. We could roll it over until next year with the hope that something better comes along. Mr. McCarroll stated that this is a project that clicks two boxes. It's Historic and Housing and it's highly visible. He hoped that to get a preservation restriction on the State Street wing of the Motorcycle Building. Mr. Finn stated that he agreed with Mr. Slate. However, their projects are meticulously maintained. Considering the track record they have and the condition of the properties they maintain around the city he didn't have any problem with funding. Mr. Slate moved to fund the Indian Motorcycle Apartments with the Housing Reserve money which totals \$175,400 for FY18 and FY19; Ms. Martinez seconded. Mr. Finn, Mr. Slate, Mr. McCarroll, and Ms. Martinez were in favor; Mr. Cook was against. Restrictions: Must meet the Secretary of Interior Standards, will be reviewed by the SHC, temporary sign recognizing CPA funding, permanent sign or smaller plaque, exterior Historic Preservation restriction on the State Street building, affordability restriction on units. Work to be completed by November 30, 2020.

The Work Hub at 77 Maple Street: Mr. McCarroll stated that this is an historic building which has been in the process of being renovated for the last several years. DevelopSpringfield owns it and has an EDA Grant to help fix it but the cost of fixing is exceeding the EDA grant. They have asked for \$125,000. They are going out for bid this fall. He added that when we look at the Historic priorities it is vacant buildings, deteriorated buildings, buildings before 1850 and this clicks many of the priorities. Ms. Martinez moved to fund 77 Maple; Mr. Finn seconded. A unanimous vote was taken. Mr. Slate moved that to allocate \$100,000; Mr. Cook seconded. Mr. McCarroll stated that the funds would come from the FY19 undesignated reserve. A unanimous vote was taken. Restrictions: Must meet the Secretary of Interior Standards, be reviewed by the SHC, temporary sign recognizing CPA, smaller sign, any funds not used must be returned to us. Work must be completed by November 30, 2020

Old First Church Study: Mr. McCarroll stated that this is to study the church complex regarding accessibility and functionality. The cost of the study is \$170,000 and they are asking for \$120,000. The church is not being used because it is not handicapped accessible. Mr. Slate moved to fund the Old First Church Study; Ms. Martinez seconded. Mr. McCarroll stated that this is one of the oldest buildings in the city, is highly visible, is deteriorating and it will get worse unless it is in active use. It cannot be in active use unless it is handicap accessible. Ms. Martinez, Ms. Mitchell, Mr. McCarroll, and Mr. Slate voted in favor; Mr. Cook and Mr. Finn voted against. Mr. Slate moved to fund \$120,000. Mr. McCarroll suggested that come from the remainder of FY19 and supplemented by left-over FY18. A unanimous vote was taken. Restrictions: Study report should acknowledge CPA assistance, any funds that are not used to be returned to CPC, study to be completed by November 30, 2020. A unanimous vote was taken.

Request PVPC Technical Assistance: Mr. McCarroll stated that the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission provides technical assistance to communities. We can get up to fifteen hours of consultation services from the trained preservation planner. Some historic projects are not involving the Historic Tax Credits, such as the Trolley Pavilion, Drama Studio rehab at St. Barnabas Church, and Colony Hills Island. We would ask the Preservation Planner from PVPC to review projects for compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards. Mr. Slate moved to request assistance; Ms. Martinez seconded. A unanimous vote was taken.

Annual Election of Chair and Vice Chair: Our ordinance requires that we elect the Chair and Vice Chair annually. Mr. Slate moved to nominate Mr. McCarroll as chair. Ms. Martinez seconded. Ms. Martinez moved to nominate Mr. Slate as vice-chair. All were in favor.

Mr. McCarroll stated that we have to start thinking of FY20. The state requires that we have an annual public hearing to solicit comments from the public as what they would like to see what CPA monies are used for. He suggested that the October 1 meeting be the hearing. There was a unanimous vote.

Ms. Martinez moved to adjourn. Next Meeting will be October 1 at 6 pm. Location to be determined.